Konstanze Jungbluth and Federica Da Milano

0 Introduction

Abstract: Exploring the topic of deixis in Romance Languages, we start with Bühler ([1]1934) and follow Cassirer ([1]1923–1929), who emphasizes the priority of spatial conceptualizations with respect to temporal ones. Furthermore, transfer of the developed distinctions may be used to express oppositions in social space. As the deictic features are anchored in person, space and time, context plays a crucial role in understanding the references. In addition, it is common to use the capacity of pointing inherent in these items to strengthen coherence of discourse or for text editing. In order to find out which features and procedures are language specific and which ones are universal, the reader finds chapters on several different Romance Languages ordered from East to West, following the conventionalized sequence. Romance varieties outside Europe are included as well. Chapters on deixis as a topic in different theoretical frameworks, as part of non-related languages, and as an aspect of language change further broaden the perspective on current research in this fascinating field.

Keywords: Romance Languages, Latin, Romanian, Sardinian, Italian, Varieties in Italy, Ladin, French, French Varieties outside of France, Catalan, European Spanish, Latin American Spanish, European Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese, Creoles, pragmatics, grammar, diachrony, synchrony, deixis, spatial deixis, temporal deixis, personal deixis, social deixis, Origo, language change, contrastive linguistics, language family, Balkan Romania, Italoromania, Francoromania, Iberoromania, Old Romania, New Romania, Eastern Romania, Western Romania

1 Preliminaries

The *Manual of Deixis in Romance Languages* offers its readers an overview of the field with a focus on Romance Languages, but it also reaches beyond this perspective. Rooted in the European tradition, research in any of the Romance Languages has always involved several comparative dimensions. First, their common Latin origins have always been part of the focus, including not only concepts of language change based on language contact, but also the diachronic nature of our research object: *language* in general. Secondly, a synchronic perspective of their "siblings", or neighboring Romance Languages, offers a wide range of grammatical structures and lexical items that can be readily compared. Finally, we learned from language contact about primary, secondary, and tertiary varieties of Romance Languages in the past and present, as well as from examples in the academic writings of our predecessors in the field (Berger, Bühler, Coseriu, Ehrich, Fillmore, Klein, Lüdtke, Rauh, Schlieben-Lange, among others). We are trained to embed our findings in language-specific contexts, to test them for some members or for the whole family of Romance Languages, and to place our

results in the context of a universal perspective. These three steps of abstraction – the studied language, the other Romance Languages, the other European and non-European languages – form part of the research process. It is not by chance that this research practice and its results play an important role in the development of research on deixis. This can be confirmed by a look at the references of the latest monographs and collections or basic scholarly works in our field of interest. Both the authors and editors of this volume are committed to this mission, and hope that the readers familiar with Romance Languages – but also those without experience in these languages – will gain new insights into deixis in general, and into the dimensions of similarities and differences between deictic structures. As proposed in the threefold approach, the use of deictic structures should be understood *within* and *between* different Romance Languages. Furthermore, we aim to show the differences of deictic structures and their use between Romance and other European and non-European languages, and in some points at the universal level of structures and language use in general.

In the following, we sketch the state of the art and will explain furthermore the structure selected for this manual. In the first part, we identify deixis as a core subject of linguistics forming part of pragmatics. The fascinating field of deixis is situated at the crossroads between grammar and semantics.

As Lenz (2003, vii) points out, it is not by chance that one of the most quoted definitions of deixis is taken from a monograph on semantics (Lyons 1977, 637):

> "By deixis is meant the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about [...] in relation to the spatiotemporal context created [...] by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee".

Conventional meanings codified by deictics (semantic coding) must be regarded as separate from the contingent contextual information and from the pragmatic context-dependent implicatures (pragmatic coding). Nevertheless, the two dimensions are interdependent and both contribute to the understanding of the utterance. According to Kemmerer (1999, 56),

> "[...] demonstratives appear to straddle the boundaries between visual perception, abstract semantic organization, and context-specific sociolinguistic interaction. It therefore makes sense that they should have connections with all three of these domains without being completely reducible to any single one of them".

2 Current interest in linguistics for deixis

Deixis is an area of research within linguistics that has drawn ever-increasing interest among scholars. It spans the fields of pragmatics and grammar, and also links the areas of pragmatics and semantics. Deixis is a crucial aspect of several closely related subdisciplines such as cognitive linguistics, anthropological linguistics, and gestures as part of communication, to name just a few.

Current interest in the topic of deixis and deictic categories in language and cognition was recently confirmed by the STALDAC (Space and Time across Languages, Disciplines and Cultures) conference held in April 2010 in Cambridge, followed by the proceedings published in two volumes by Benjamins in 2012; the Pisa International Conference on "Space in language" (October 2009; cf. Marotta et al. 2010) and the International Workshop "Space and language: on deixis" organized by Federica Da Milano and Paolo Zublena at the University of Milano-Bicocca (Da Milano/Zublena, forthcoming).

Recent work on the topic has recontextualized deictic use within both an interactional (cf. Goodwin 2000; 2003; Hanks 1990; Haviland 1996) and an ethnographic perspective (Duranti 1994; Hanks 1990; Keating 1994), and our Manual will give particular emphasis to this viewpoint.

From a typological point of view, a good reference study is the classic chapter by Anderson/Keenan (1985), which deals with the fundamental deictic categories (space, time, person) in the languages of the world; Diessel's monograph (1999) is a milestone in the study on demonstratives and on spatial deixis in general. Chapters on different aspects of deictic categories are systematically included in the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS).

3 Deixis: part of pragmatics

The field of research on deixis forms part of pragmatics. Language is perceived as language use embedded in action. Empirical data represented in spoken discourse or in text are prepared for our linguistic analysis in the form of smaller or larger corpora. Language use is not understood as a mere application of form and structure, of words and grammar. The use of deictic elements in any language of the world reveals the piggy-back process of anchoring that is essential for the understanding of language in general. Words and the rules for combining them are achieved through steps of abstraction which are sequentially organized. As in other sciences, we take the tension between theory and empirical basic data seriously. Although it may be true that the difference between theories is less than that between different empirical settings, we believe that the research process is fed by the reciprocal confrontation between them. This back-and-forth leads directly to findings obtained by "[d]eduction, induction, and abduction [which] are three basic forms of inference"[1] (Jensen 2008, 1188; cf. Peirce 1898/2002) with the shared aim to develop and refine a cross-linguistically proved theory on deixis.

---

[1] The citation is completed by the following subordinated clause [three basic forms of inference] "that inform the methodologies of communication research as well as other fields and disciplines" (Jensen 2008, 1188).

Overcoming the traditional speaker- or distance-oriented view, which takes only the perspective of the speaker as *Origo*, our shared pivot and focal point in research on deixis starts from language use in dialogue, where the speaker and her or his hearer/s meet. While the speaker is only one person, her or his audience may consist of one or more hearers.[2] Language use is based in the *Dualis*, in the duality formed by at least two interlocutors, who together form the *Origo* based in the conversational dyad. The speaker speaks even to her- or himself as if speaking to another. The author writes her or his text expecting that it will be read by another. The other, the *Alter* indispensably complements the *Ego*. Without interlocutor she or he falls silent. The dialogue is not only the place where language use begins but an important part of human interaction.

> "Imagine a language-game in which A asks and B reports the number of slabs or blocks in a pile, [...]. –
> Such a report might run: 'Five slabs'. Now what is the difference between the report or statement 'Five slabs' and the order 'Five slabs!'? – Well, it is the part which uttering these words plays in the language game. No doubt the tone of voice and the look with which they are uttered, and much else besides, will also be different" (Wittgenstein [1]1914–1916/1984, 248)

The last part of the citation ["und noch manches mehr" 'and much else besides'] is often filled with a gesture in face-to-face-communication. "When people say things they typically do so by combining words with images"[3] (Enfield 2013, 691).

> "Human conceptualization of space is primarily determined by visual perception, by the three dimensional visual field. [...] The orientation has a characteristic double structure: it starts in the own body on the one hand, in the objectively given space as points of reference on the other hand" (Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, 326s.).

In the first example used by Enfield, "Make it steep like this", the meaning of words and gesture are carefully intertwined parts of the composite utterance.[4] It is not by chance that the demonstrative in this case plays a prominent role. The meaning is interactively achieved by three devices: (1) the tight "spatiotemporal co-occurrence [of words and gesture] in place and time (both produced by the same source), (2) the use of explicit deictic expression 'like this' (sending us on a search: 'Like what', and leading us to consult the gesture for an answer), (3) the use of eye gaze for directing attention" (Enfield 2013, 692). Bühler ([1]1934) was one of the first to show that even one-word utterances are complete signs regardless of the fact that they often lack a

---

2 Leaving aside the possibility of speaking in chorus.

3 With Enfield (2013) we consider strings of words themselves as a composite sign "consisting of words and grammatical constructions".

4 "Make it steep like this". The utterance forms part of "a corpus of video-recorded talk collected in Laos since 2000". "[T]hree Lao men [are] sitting in a village temple, one of them thrusting his arm forward and down, with his gaze fixed on it" (Enfield 2013, 691).

predicate and do not form a sentence. Not until after Bühler's observation were these utterances considered to represent an object worth of linguistic analysis at all. Bühler's famous examples, "I", uttered by a visitor as an answer to someone behind the door, and "Here", exclaimed by someone in the audience claiming his/her presence when a list of names is read aloud are deictic expressions, too. The three axes of place, time and person – here, now and I/You – determine the axis of the *Origo*.

4 Deixis: anchoring in space and time

It is the relation to the spatial and temporal anchoring of the ongoing social interaction between the speaker and her or his hearer/s which makes deictic elements different from others. "I" and "Here" refer to someone or someplace different in each occasion of their use. Pronouns, adverbs and determinants are the most prominent word classes which have this deictic dimension as part of their meanings. Compare the deictic and the non-deictic use in the following pairs of sentences:

A) The noise of aircrafts pollutes more and more our environment here. *versus*
B) Close to the Frankfurt International Airport aircraft noise is considered a growing environmental problem.

A) At that time Hugo Chávez died. *versus*
B) In March 2013 Hugo Chávez died.

It is obvious that in the first case the spatial information, and in the second the temporal relation is expressed deictically in both sentences labeled as A). Consequently, in order to understand the reference, one has to take into consideration the place and moment where the sentences have been uttered. The same does not hold for the other two sentences. It is true that not only deictic elements change their references in the world when uttered, but only deictic elements are anchored in one way or another to at least one of the spatiotemporal or personal dimensions. These dimensions are in turn determined by the interlocutors involved in the ongoing conversation.

Though most deictic dimensions belong to the set of closed word classes mentioned above, they are not restricted to only these classes. They also form part of words belonging to open word classes, most frequently as verbal morphemes of person and time (e.g. "he sings"; "they sang"), as motion verbs (e.g. "to come"), and as some locative and temporal adjectives (e.g. "northern cities"; "last summer") and expressions. The latter may be proven by paraphrasing the above sentence in the following way: "Two months ago Hugo Chávez died".

5 Deixis: spatial oppositions and their transfer

Ontogenetic and phylogenetic data convincingly show that spatial experience is first in language acquisition (see e.g. Tomasello 2009), as in processes of language change accompanying the evolution of languages themselves (Cassirer [1]1923–1929/[10]1994). Spatial categories are directly accessible to humans (see citation above). Inside is different from outside. The speaker's space may be put in opposition to the one of the hearer. The opposition between close and distant spaces is basic. In some languages, a space at a middle distance is also routinely established. Spatial categories like river up, river down or mountain up, mountain down reflect environmentally important distinctions in some languages spoken by communities who make their living in these respective places.

6 Deixis: structuring time through space

The perception of time, which may even be restricted to our species, is realized by the metaphorical transfer of oppositions based in space to the temporal flow.

> "We have seen the fluidity of the dividing line between imitative or affective sounds and the simplest spatial terms – and we encounter the same continuous, imperceptible transition between the linguistic spheres embracing local and temporal determinations. Even in our modern civilized languages these two often form an inseparable unity; it is common to find one and the same word used to express both spatial and temporal relations. [...] for example, the word for 'here' merges with the word for 'now', the word for 'there' with that for 'earlier' or 'later'" (Cassirer [1]1923–1929/[10]1973, 216).

> "Involuntarily, language transposes the structural relations of time into relations of space. [...] But where consciousness is limited to spatial intuition and apprehends temporal relations only through spatial analogies [sic!] – this unique character of the direction of time must remain obscure. As in the intuition of space, everything is here reduced to the simple distinction of near and far. The only essential difference that is grasped and clearly expressed is that between 'now' and 'not-now' – between the immediate present and that which lies 'outside' it" (Cassirer [1]1923–1929/[10]1973, 217).

The categories routinized on spatial oppositions are regularly used to structure time, which is less easily accessible and object of (metaphorical) abstraction.

> "Based on space time is conceptualized as a continuous and directed movement following a path, which may be represented by a time arrow" (Hoffmann 1997, 339, our translation).

Past is regularly opposed to present, sometimes subdivided in a nearer and a distant past. The latter holds true for European Spanish, where the present *este año* 'this year' stays in opposition to *ese* 'that [year]' and to a remote past referred to by *aquel*

entonces 'that time far away'.[5] The conceptualization of future is even more fragile. Some cultures place a taboo on this uncertain dimension (e.g. in the Arabic world). Some languages have not developed categories of their own to express a future not grounded in the present. Other languages mirror the time arrow in both directions – towards the past and towards the future – making twofold distinctions on both sides.[6] Moreover, in Chinese 'last month' is *shànyuè* (lit. 'above-month'), 'next month' is *xiàyuè* (lit. 'under-month'). In Aymara spoken in Peru *nayra timpu* 'the past' is literally 'eye time = time in front of my eyes' and *q'ipi uru* 'tomorrow' is literally 'the day behind me'.

7 Deixis: transfer to structure social space

Oppositions developed to categorize space may be transferred to other spaces, for example to the social space (cf. Fillmore 1975; Levinson 1979; Rauh 1983a, among others). Here the distance parameter inherent of spatial oppositions plays a crucial role. On the one hand, power distinctions are metaphorically mapped into a hierarchically structured up and down. The higher the person is assumed to be situated, the more power she or he possesses compared to other people. Maintaining the distance through the drawing of borderlines between them reflects these relations of social power:[7]

On the other hand, emotional closeness may be expressed by integrating the other in one unique social space, thus not establishing a borderline among the interlocutors. Overcoming the individual point of view, this conceptualization of an undivided space as one and only one is essential for concerted actions of any group starting with the pair. Language use focused as social activity is rooted in the conversational dyad formed by speaker and hearer/s representing the shared *Origo*.

It is their involvement which characterizes the participants engaged in conversation.

> "[A]n internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories and words" (Tannen 1989, 12).

---

5 It is not surprising that some of the widespread Latin American Spanishes did not maintain this fine-grained distinction (due to language contact?). "Nearly in all American countries *ese entonces* is used [instead], sometimes alternating with the variant *en aquel entonces*, in other places replacing this idiom by majority or even exclusively" (RAE 2009, 1281; translation K.J.).

6 However, the use of the future is less frequent.

7 The socially reinterpreted spatial deictics may be strengthened by the use of personal pronouns, namely honorifics such as the famous V/T pronouns (*vous/tu*; cf. Brown/Gilman 1960; Levinson 1979; Helmbrecht 2005).

According to Hanks (1990, 7):

> "In assuming egocentricity in deixis, one runs the risk of mistaking a part of the whole, overlooking several basic facts: interaction puts in play the reciprocity of perspectives, the production of mutual knowledge, conflict and asymmetry".

And again citing Hanks (1990, 107s.):

> "Given that acts of reference are interactively accomplished, a sociocentric approach is certain to be more productive than an egocentric one, even when the speaker is the primary ground of reference".

Reference to absent or present human participants in a speech event is the primary function of personal pronouns. Another aspect of the reference of personal pronouns, however, is what has been called social deixis in literature. There are many languages in which different pronominal forms may be used to indicate different degrees of respect. For a detailed analysis of politeness distinctions in second person pronouns from a typological point of view, see Helmbrecht (2003).

8 Deixis: structuring the space of text and discourse

Textual deixis or discourse deixis has been theorized (as *discourse deixis, textual deixis, Rededeixis, Textdeixis*) by Fillmore (1972), Braunmüller (1977) and Lyons (1977). According to Conte (1999, 17):

> "La deissi testuale è quella forma di deissi con la quale un parlante fa, nel discorso, riferimento al discorso stesso, al discorso in atto, ossia a parti (a segmenti, o momenti), dell'ongoing discourse (in particolare: o al pre-testo, o al post-testo, o, nel logicamente problematico caso dell'autoriferimento, a quella stessa enunciazione, nella quale l'espressione deittica ricorre)".

Textual as well as discourse deixis provide a transition between the notions of deixis and anaphora, because they involve the use of the deictic procedure to point to part of a pre- or post-mentioned textual or memory representation.[8]

9 Deixis: maintaining oppositions in spoken language

As far as Romance Languages are concerned, many studies are devoted to particular languages or even subvarieties of them (see Jungbluth 2005 for Ibero-Romance

---

8 These representations have no need to be highly activated.

languages; Gaudino-Fallegger 1992 and Vanelli 1992 for Italian, etc.); Da Milano (2005) is a study on spatial deixis in the languages of Europe, where the author considers Romance Languages in relation to the other world languages.

Languages of the world reflect the wide range of humankind's natural creativity. The different deictic structures – not only the items themselves, but the oppositions between them that we use to make space accessible to us – reflect that neither space itself nor our use of it are cross-culturally alike. This difference reflects the diversity of natural environments and of humankind at the same time. Space is basic, and deictic structures are firmly rooted within space. They are and have been created and used daily by people all over the world, who also constantly maintain and change them.

Routinized use in spoken language may even preserve items lost in varieties which are closer to the norm. Focusing on English spoken in Northern England and Shetland as compared to Standard English, Melchers (1997) not only confirms the cross-linguistically common use of distal demonstratives to express depreciation, but reports on its implications for reluctance towards language change:[9]

> "The maintenance of a three-way system [this – that – yon] as still evidenced in Shetland dialect today indicates that [the use of three demonstratives] is above all of an emotional-attitudinal character" (Melchers 1997, 91).[10]

This diversity is not restricted to the difference between languages, but also appears at the level of varieties of languages. It is not by accident that even closely related language varieties differ in the way they structure space.

10 Structure of this volume

This volume will therefore include chapters on deixis, not only with regard to languages of Eastern and Western Romania (Wartburg 1950), forming together the territory of so-called Old Romania, but also on languages of New Romania spoken on other continents. Alongside Romanian, Italian, Ladin, French, Spanish and Catalan, European and Brazilian Portuguese, we include chapters on the varieties of French in the francophone world, on Latin American Spanish(es), and on Romance language varieties in Italy, the autochthonous "descendent" of the ancient Latin core.

The ordering of the Romance Languages of Europe follow the conventionalized sequence from East to West, starting with languages of the Balkan Romania, Italoromania, Francoromania and finally of Iberoromania (cf. Tagliavini 1948/²1998). Using language history as a guideline, the chapters on the languages spoken outside Europe

---

9 "Demonstratives are highlighted and typically associated with informal, unplanned types of discourse, such as conversational interaction" (Melchers 1997, 90).
10 "It is also pointed out that *yon* tends to be used in phrases with euphemistic or depreciatory force" (Melchers 1997, 85).

follow the chapters of the languages of their respective colonial nations. After this first part, we further expand the aspects of deixis in three directions.

The first treats deixis embedded in different theoretical and traditional frameworks including semantics, structuralism, contextualism, indexicalism, minimalism, cognitive linguistics, referentiality and typology.

The second has a more empirical nature. Two chapters will focus on the diachronic aspects revealing the changes from Latin to different forms of Vulgar Latin, and finally to the Romance Languages. One of them exclusively focuses on the French deictic systems, which underwent important changes beginning in the period of Old French, passing through the period of Middle French, to the French spoken today. A chapter on deictic systems that experienced language change and were affected by language contact forms precedes a series of chapters which contribute points of comparison to our view on deixis in Romance Languages by investigating deixis in other European and non-related languages of the world: Japanese and Mesoamerican languages among others.

The third considers the interfaces between deixis and neighboring fields of interest, considering that

> "contrasting languages means not only contrasting language systems, but also contrasting language use in all its dynamics, mainly discourse strategies, commonly shared inferences, presuppositions, and, as part of contrastive pragmatics, also contrasting (anthropological) cultures" (Filipović/Jaszczolt 2012, 1).

Chapters on social interaction, corpus linguistics, gesture and finally discourse deixis complete and round off this volume.

11 References

Anderson, Stephen R./Keenan, Edward L. (1985), *Deixis*, in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 259–308.

Berger, Tilman (1991), *Überlegungen zur Deixis im Russischen*, Slavistische Beiträge 274, 9–34.

Braunmüller, Kurt (1977), *Referenz und Pronominalisierung. Zu den Deiktika und Proformen des Deutschen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Brown, Roger/Gilman, Albert (1960), *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity*, American Anthropologist 4 (6), 24–39.

Bühler, Karl (1982 [¹1934]), *Sprachtheorie*, Stuttgart, Fischer; (1950) *Teoría del lenguaje*, translated into Spanish by Julián Marías, Madrid, Alianza; (1990) *Theory of Language*, translated into English by Donald F. Goodwin, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Cassirer, Ernst (1955, ¹⁰1973, [¹1923–1929]), *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*, vol. 1: *Die Sprache*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgemeinschaft; (1955) *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, vol. 1: *Language*, translated into English by Ralph Manheim, London, Yale University Press.

Conte, Maria-Elisabeth (1999), *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1955), *Determinación y entorno: dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar*, Romanistisches Jahrbuch 7, 29–54; (1975) *Determinierung und Umfeld. Zwei Probleme einer Linguistik des Sprechens*, translated by Uwe Petersen, in: *Sprachtheorie und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, München, Fink, 253–291.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1988), *Historische Sprache und Dialekt*, in: Jörn Albrecht et al. (edd.), *Energeia und Ergon*, vol. 1: *Schriften von 1965–1987*, Tübingen, Narr, 44–61.

Da Milano, Federica (2005), *La deissi spaziale nelle lingue d'Europa*, Milano, Angeli.

Da Milano, Federica/Zublena, Paolo (edd.) (forthcoming), *Space and language: on deixis*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger (1999), *Demonstratives. Form, function and grammaticalization*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Dryer, Matthew S./Haspelmath, Martin (edd.) (2005), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press (since 2011 also available online, *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Munich, Max Planck Digital Library, <http://wals.info/> (09.01.2013).

Duranti, A. (1994), *From Grammar to Politics: Linguistic Anthropology in a Western Samoan Village*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Ehlich, Konrad (1982), *Anaphora and Deixis: Same, Similar or Different?* in: Robert J. Jarvella/Wolfgang Klein (edd.), *Speech, place and action: Studies in deixis and related topics*, Chichester, Wiley & Sons, 315–338.

Ehrich, Veronika (1992), *Hier und Jetzt*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Enfield, Nick J. (2013), *A "Composite Utterances" approach to meaning*, in: Cornelia Müller et al. (edd.), *Body – Language – Communication: An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction Vol. 1*, Berlin/Boston, Mouton De Gruyter, 689–706.

Filipović, Luna/Jaszczolt, Kasia M. (edd.) (2012), *Space and Time in Languages and Cultures*, 2 vol., Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Fillmore, Charles (1972), *Ansätze zu einer Theorie der Deixis*, in: Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Semantik und generative Grammatik*, vol. 1, Frankfurt am Main, Athenäum, 147–174.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1975), *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Gaudino-Fallegger, Livia (1992), *I dimostrativi nell'italiano parlato*, Wilhelmsfeld, Egert.

Goodwin, Charles (2000), *Action and embodiment within situated human interaction*, Journal of Pragmatics 32, 1489–1522.

Goodwin, Charles (2003), *Pointing as Situated Social Practice*, in: Sotaro Kita (ed.), *Pointing: Where language, culture, and cognition meet*, Hillsdale/NJ, Erlbaum, 217–241.

Hanks, William (1990), *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Haviland, John (1996), *Projections, transpositions, and relativity*, in: John Gumperz/Stephen C. Levinson (edd.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 271–323.

Helmbrecht, Johannes (2003), *Politeness distinctions in second person pronouns*, in: Friedrich Lenz (ed.), *Deictic conceptualisation of space, time and person*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 183–202.

Helmbrecht, Johannes (2005), *Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns*, in: Martin Haspelmath et al. (edd.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 186–190.

Hernández Socas, Elia/Sinner, Carsten/Wotjak, Gerd (edd.) (2011), *Estudios de tiempo y espacio en la gramática española*, Frankfurt am Main, Lang.

Hoffmann, Ludger (1997), *Deixis und situative Orientierung*, in: Gisela Zifonun/Ludger Hoffmann/Bruno Strecker, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, 3 vols., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 309–359.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn (2008), *Deduction vs Induction vs Abduction*, in: Wolfgang Donsbach (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*, vol. 3, Oxford, Blackwell, 1188–1192.

Jungbluth, Konstanze (2005), *Pragmatik der Demonstrativpronomina in den iberoromanischen Sprachen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Jungbluth, Konstanze (2012), *39. Einzelaspekt: Deixis*, in: Joachim Born et al. (edd.), *Handbuch Spanisch*, Berlin, Schmidt, 313–318.

Jungbluth, Konstanze/Klein, Wolfgang (edd.) (2002), *Deixis – universelle und einzelsprachliche Aspekte*, Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik 125.

Keating, Elizabeth L. (1994), *Language, gender, rank and social space. Honorifics in Pohnpei, Micronesia*, in: *Cultural Performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, Berkeley, Women and Language Press, 367–377.

Keating, Elizabeth L. (1998), *Power sharing*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Kemmerer, David (1999), *"Near" and "far" in language and perception*, Cognition 73, 35–63.

Klein, Wolfgang (1978), *Präliminarien zu einer Untersuchung der lokalen Deixis*, Linguistische Berichte 58, 18–40.

Klein, Wolfgang (ed.) (1991), *Sprache und Raum*, Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik 78.

Kragh, Kirsten Jeppesen (ed.) (2013), *Deixis and pronouns in Romance Languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Krefeld, Thomas (2011), *"Primäre", "sekundäre", "tertiäre" Dialekte – und die Geschichte des italienischen Sprachraums*, in: Anja Overbeck/Wolfgang Schweickard/Harald Völker (edd.), *Lexikon, Varietät, Philologie. Günter Holtus zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 137–147.

Kristol, Andres (1998), *Die historische Klassifikation der Romania III. Rätoromanisch*, in: Günter Holtus/Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. VII: *Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen. Kontrastivität, Klassifikation und Typologie*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 937–948.

Lenz, Friedrich (ed.) (2003), *Deictic conceptualisation of space, time and person*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1979), *Pragmatics and social deixis: Reclaiming the notion of conventional implicature*, in: Christine Chiarello (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 206–223.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983), *Pragmatics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press; (1989) *Pragmática*, Barcelona, Teide; (1990) *Pragmatik*, Tübingen, Niemeyer; (2007) *Pragmática*, São Paulo, Martins Fontes.

Levinson, Stephen C./Wilkins, David P. (edd.) (2006), *Grammars of space: explorations in cognitive diversity*, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Lüdtke, Helmut (2000), *Kleine Beiträge zur portugiesischen Sprachgeschichte*, in: Cornelia Klettke et al. (edd.), *Ästhetik der Texte – Varietät von Sprache*, Tübingen, Narr, 211–223.

Lyons, John (1977), *Semantics*, 2 vol., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Marotta, Giovanna, et al. (edd.) (2010), *Space in language: Proceedings of the Pisa International Conference*, Pisa, Ets.

Melchers, Gunnel (1997), *This, that, yon: on "Three Dimensional" Deictic Systems*, in: Jenny Cheshire/Dieter Stein (edd.), *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*, Harlow, Longman, 83–92.

Mondada, Lorenza (1994), *Verbalisation de l'espace et fabrication du savoir*, Lausanne, Beck.

Monticelli, Daniele/Pajusalu, Renate/Treikelder, Anu (edd.) (2005), *From utterance to uttering and viceversa: Multidisciplinary views on deixis*, Tartu, Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Peirce, Charles Sanders (1898/2002), *Das Denken und die Logik des Universums – Die Vorlesungen der Cambridge Conferences von 1898*, translated by Helmut Pape, Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp.

Rauh, Gisa (1983a), *Aspects of deixis*, in: Gisa Rauh (ed.), *Essays on Deixis*, Tübingen, Narr, *9–60*.

Rauh, Gisa (ed.) (1983b), *Essays on Deixis*, Tübingen, Narr.

Real Academia Española (2009), *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*, 2 vol., Madrid, Espasa.

Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte (1975), *Linguistische Pragmatik*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.

Sinner, Carsten/Tabares Plasencia, Encarnación/Montoro del Arco, Esteban T. (edd.) (2012), *Tiempo, espacio y relaciones espacio-temporales en la fraseología y paremiología españolas*, München, Urbanek.

Tagliavini, Carlo (1948), *Le origini delle lingue neolatine. Corso introduttivo di filologia romanza*, Bologna, Pàtron; ([2]1998) *Einführung in die romanische Philologie*, translated into German by Reinhard Meisterfeld and Uwe Petersen, Tübingen, Francke.

Tannen, Deborah (1989), *Talking voices: repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Tomasello, Michel (2009), Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition, Harvard, Harvard University Press.

Vanelli, Laura (1992), *La deissi in italiano*, Padova, Unipress.

Wartburg, Walther von (1950), *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*, Bern, Francke.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig ([1]1914–1916/1984), *Tractatus logico-philosophicus; Tagebücher 1914–1916; Philosophische Untersuchungen*, Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp; (1958) *Philosophical Investigations*, translated into English by G. Elizabeth M. Anscombe, Oxford, Blackwell.

Zifonun, Gudrun/Hoffmann, Ludger/Strecker, Bruno (1997), *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, 3 vols., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.